REMARKS

The Applicants' representatives thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the office interview of May 4, 2005. This Supplemental Reply has been prepared to incorporate numerous helpful suggestions offered by the Examiner.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the claims could be improved by strengthening the language reciting how the structure and functions of the management computer and storage system cooperate with each other. In particular, the Examiner suggested that a stronger recitation of how the user name is used in the process would make more clear the differences between the claimed invention and the disclosure of Blumenau, et al., US 6,421,711 (Blumenau). To this end, the claims have been amended. In addition, the Applicants offer the following comments directed specifically to points raised during the interview.

With regard to the table shown in Fig. 5 of Blumenau, an administrator simply enters a volume list for a group name (a group name is similar to a host ID) at a keyboard, and according to the entered information, the microprocessor of the storage subsystem create a table entry for the group name and a pointer to the volume list in the volume access table

(see also Fig. 16, steps 163 and 164, and Column 19, line 67 to Column 20, line 9 of the patent). Then, the storage system permits a particular computer to access particular logical units based on the volume access table (see Fig. 11 and Column 17, line 9 to Column 18, line 5). Therefore, Blumenau does not disclose any elements which refer to a management table to find logical unit identification information corresponding to the received user name, as required by the independent claims. In other words, in Blumenau, the host ID and volume list are directly used by the storage subsystem, but in claim 29 (for example), the management computer first finds the logical unit identification information to be used by the storage system based on the received user name by referring to the management table, and then the management computer transmits the found logical unit identification information (logical unit ID) and the computer identification information (computer ID) to the storage system.

Moreover, it seems important to emphasize that receipt of the user name (as recited in claim 29) should not be equated with the user login with password disclosed by Blumenau in Column 36, line 65 to Column 37, line 3. In this passage, Blumenau states that the user login with password is for user

verification by the operating system of the host, and not

related with the volume access list, based on which the

storage system permits the particular computer to access

particular volumes.   On the other hand, in claim 29, the user

name is used to find the logical unit ID to be transmitted to

the storage system by the management computer.   Based on the

transmitted logical unit ID and computer ID, the storage

system permits the particular computer to access the a

particular volume.   Therefore, how the user name is used is

different between Blumenau and claim 29.

The Applicants' representative invites the Examiner to

telephone him at the number below to discuss any aspect of the

invention, and specifically requests a telephone call if the

Examiner finds the application not to be in condition for

allowance for any reason.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicants

</div>

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia   22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: May 9, 2005